

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of the name *Dactylozodes* Chevrolat, 1838 (Insecta, Coleoptera)
(Case 3393; see BZN 64: 43–44)

(1) C.L. Bellamy

*Plant Pest Diagnostics Branch, California Department of Food & Agriculture,
3294 Meadowview Road, Sacramento, California 95832, U.S.A.*
(e-mail: cbellamy@cdfa.ca.gov)

I write to ask for an amendment to the application to conserve the usage of the name *Dactylozodes* Chevrolat, 1838 proposed by myself and T. Moore Rodriguez.

In para. 9(2) we recorded *Dactylozodes* as feminine. In point of fact it should be treated as masculine in accordance with Article 30.1.4.4 of the Code, which records that ‘a compound genus-group name ending in *-odes* is to be treated as masculine unless its author, when establishing the name, stated that it had another gender or treated it as such by combining it with an adjectival species-group name in another gender form’.

(2) Svatopluk Bílý

*Department of Entomology, National Museum, Kunratice 1, 148 00 Praha 4,
Czech Republic* (e-mail: svatopluk_bily@nm.cz)

I support the application by Bellamy & Moore to conserve the prevailing usage of the generic name *Dactylozodes* Chevrolat, 1838. I agree with the authors’ proposed suppression of *Lasionota* Mannerheim, 1837 in favour of *Dactylozodes* Chevrolat, 1838 (BUPRESTIDAE). Mannerheim’s name has hardly been used for more than 100 years, and can be treated as a nomen oblitum.

However, *Dactylozodes* should be treated as masculine rather than feminine for the following reasons:

(1) According to Article 30.1.4.4 of the Code all genus-group names ending with *-odes* should be treated as masculine;

(2) Chevrolat (1838) described *Dactylozodes* as a masculine name, including two nominal species: *D. alternans* and *D. tetrazonus*).

Comments on the proposed conservation of the subfamilial name ORTHOCLADIINAE Kieffer, 1911 and on the proposed type-species fixation for *Orthocladius* van der Wulp, 1874 (Diptera, CHIRONOMIDAE)
(Case 3355; see BZN 64: 45–53)

(1) M. Spies

*c/o Zoologische Staatssammlung München, Münchhausenstr. 21, 81247 München,
Germany* (e-mail: spies@zi.biologie.uni-muenchen.de)

N.L. Evenhuis

*J. Linsley Gressitt Center for Research in Entomology, Bishop Museum,
1525 Bernice Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817, U.S.A.*
(e-mail: neale@bishopmuseum.org)

Subsequent to publication of the application in this case, the present junior author (NLE) has discovered that publication priority between chironomid names published in the two works the application cites as van der Wulp (1874a) and van der Wulp (1874b) respectively is clear after all, rather than open to first-reviser action as proposed in the application.

According to Barendrecht & Kruseman (1957; cited in the application), the earliest confirmed publication date for issue 4 of volume 17 of the *Tijdschrift voor Entomologie* is 29 August 1874, whereas for issue 5 of the same volume that date is 31 July 1875. Copies of volume 17 at the NHM and Australian Museum libraries seen by NLE still include the issue wrappers. The latter show: (1) that the work by van der Wulp (1874–1875; cited as ‘1874b’ in the application) spans both those issues 4 (pages 109–112 of van der Wulp’s paper) and 5 (pp. 113–148), (2) that the chironomid genus-group names in that work appeared in issue 5 (on pp. 128 onwards), and (3) that, hence, these names were not published effectively simultaneously with the corresponding set of names in van der Wulp (1874 = ‘1874a’ in the application).

Therefore, the genus name *Orthocladius* is available from van der Wulp (1874), and the same applies to all other chironomid genus-group names first proposed in that work.

In addition, all the bibliographic references to van der Wulp’s respective works in Case 3355 must be corrected from ‘1874a’ to 1874, and from ‘1874b’ to 1874–1875. Moreover, all references to purportedly simultaneous publication of the two sets of chironomid genus-group names in those works must be corrected accordingly. Specifically: (1) the decision of publication priority by first-reviser action proposed in para. 9 of the application is null and void, and the entire paragraph to be ignored in further considerations; (2) there is no nominal species originally included in *Orthocladius* van der Wulp, 1874; the ten species assigned to the genus in van der Wulp (1874–1875) must be treated as subsequently included.

All the corrections in this comment paper notwithstanding, the main arguments and aims of the application remain unaffected. As concerns the detailed course of Commission action sought, only one minor change is necessary: In para. 21(2)(a), the reference ‘1874(b)’ must be changed to 1874; the corrected sub-paragraph reads:

- (a) *Orthocladius* van der Wulp, 1874 (gender: masculine), type species *Chironomus oblidens* Walker, 1856, as ruled in (1)(b) above;

On a final note, the work cited in the application as Evenhuis (1989) was written, not edited, by the said author.

References

- Wulp, F.M. van der. 1874. [... over het geslacht *Chironomus* Meig. ...]. *Tijdschrift voor Entomologie*, **16**: lxi–lxxi.
 Wulp, F.M. van der. 1874–1875. Dipterologische aantekeningen. *Tijdschrift voor Entomologie*, **17**: 109–148.

(2) Torbjørn Ekrem

Museum of Natural History and Archaeology, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NO-7491 Trondheim, Norway (e-mail: Torbjorn.Ekrem@vm.ntnu.no)

I support the action proposed by Martin Spies. Both the genus name *Orthocladius* and the subfamily name ORTHOCLADIINAE are now very well-founded in chironomid taxonomy and nomenclature, and a subsequent change in these names would cause much confusion among both taxonomists and freshwater ecologists. I therefore urge the Commission to fix the type species of *Orthocladius* to *Chironomus oblidens* Walker, 1856 and to give the subfamily name ORTHOCLADIINAE Kieffer, 1911 precedence over both ERETMOPTERINAE Kellogg, 1900 and CLUNIONINAE Kieffer, 1906.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Lithocolletis oxyacanthae* Frey, 1855 (currently *Phyllonorycter oxyacanthae*; Insecta, Lepidoptera) by giving it precedence over *Lithocolletis pomonella* Zeller, 1846 (Case 3376; see BZN 64: 96–99)

(1) Giorgio Baldizzone

via Manzoni 24, 14100 Asti, Italy (e-mail: giorgiobaldizzone@tin.it)

I read Paolo Triberti's application (Case 3376) about the synonymy of *Phyllonorycter oxyacanthae* (Frey, 1855) and *Phyllonorycter pomonella* (Zeller, 1846). In my opinion it is correct and in accordance with the Code's recommendations.

(2) Jurate De Prins

Royal Museum for Central-Africa, Section of Entomology, Leuvensesteenweg 13, B-3080 Tervuren, Belgium (e-mail: jurate.de.prins@africamuseum.be)

Willy De Prins

Universiteit van Amsterdam, Zoölogisch Museum, Plantage-Middenlaan 64, NL-1018 DH Amsterdam, The Netherlands

While acting as referees to the paper 'The *Phyllonorycter* species from the Palaearctic Region feeding on ROSACEAE (Lepidoptera, Gracillariidae)' by Paolo Triberti we have pointed to the problem of the misidentification and confusion of three species: *Phyllonorycter oxyacanthae* (Frey, 1855), *P. pomonella* (Zeller, 1846) and a manuscript name *P. hostis* Triberti, 2007 (in press). During our own GRACILLARIIDAE studies, we have encountered the same problem as Triberti, namely the continuous confusion caused in many publications by the name *Lithocolletis pomonella* Zeller, 1846. That name has been applied to various species, e.g. *Phyllonorycter cydoniella* ([Denis & Schiffmüller]), 1775, *P. spinicolella* (Zeller, 1846), and *P. sorbi* (Frey, 1855). *P. oxyacanthae* (Frey, 1855) is a widely spread European species feeding on *Crataegus* spp. and *Pyrus* spp. (32 and 5 citations respectively from the 'Global Taxonomic Database of Gracillariidae (Lepidoptera)' (De Prins & De Prins, 2006), and this name has been used at least in 136 faunistic publications (see *Global Gracillariidae Database at the Royal Museum for Central Africa*, and De Prins & De Prins, 2005). The name *pomonella* Zeller, 1846 was used in at least 79 agricultural publications mainly to indicate a pest species on *Malus* without any taxonomic background. Therefore, we would like to support the proposition of Paolo Triberti and ask the International Commission on Zoological